

1 DRAWING AMENDMENTS

2 The drawings were objected to in the Office Action as not conforming to 37
3 CFR 1.84(u)(1). In particular, the Examiner stated that the term "Fig." should be
4 replaced with "FIG." Applicant has accordingly made the appropriate changes,
5 and replacement drawings, with each drawing labeled "Replacement Sheet", are
6 now attached.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-40 now conform to the Examiner's Amendment made on June 3, 2005, and are in condition for allowance as the Examiner has indicated. (Office Action 06/03/05, pg. 11). Also, at the Examiner's request new claim 41 has been formally added and is now in condition for allowance. (Office Action 06/03/05, pg. 11). Furthermore, all above amendments to the specification and claims have been made at the Examiner's request. Applicant submits that the case is now in condition for immediate allowance as indicated by the Examiner.

Amendments to the Specification

The Examiner also objected to the disclosure, stating that the term “implementations” should replace “implantations” on page 2, line 12 of Applicant’s specification. Applicant has made the necessary amendment, as shown above.

Claim Objections

Claim 35 was objected to by the Examiner because of informality. Specifically, the Examiner asked Applicant to insert the term “a” between the terms “is” and “portable.” As shown above, Applicant has accommodated this request.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The Examiner stated in the Action that is “is unclear whether the ‘One or more computer-readable’ media of line 1 is the ‘device’ of the preamble of claim 29 or whether it is another memory altogether.” (Office Action, p. 10). Applicant has thus amended claim 34 to provide further clarity.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-40 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/301,800. A terminal disclaimer accompanies this response to obviate the double patenting rejection.

Conclusion

Claims 1-41 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is requested to urgently contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: Aug. 1, 2005

By: Lewis C. Lee
Lewis C. Lee
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 34,656
(509) 324-9256 ext. 211